

Directorate of Higher Education Reviews

Programme Follow-Up Visit Summary

Bachelor in Mass Communication
College of Arts
University of Bahrain
Kingdom of Bahrain

First Follow-up Visit Date: 21-23 September 2020 Review Date: 5-9 November 2017 HC108-C2-F015

Table of Contents

| Th | ne Programm | e Follow- up Visit Overview | 2 |
|----|--------------|---|----|
| 1. | Indicator 1: | The Learning Programme | 4 |
| 2. | Indicator 2: | Efficiency of the Programme | 5 |
| 3. | Indicator 3: | Academic standards of the graduates | 6 |
| 4. | Indicator 4: | Effectiveness of quality management and assurance | 8 |
| 5. | Conclusion | | 9 |
| Αj | opendix 1: | Judgement per recommendation. | 10 |
| Αı | opendix 2: | Overall Judgement. | 11 |

The Programme Follow- up Visit Overview

The follow-up visit for academic programmes conducted by the Directorate of Higher Education Reviews (DHR) of the Education & Training Quality Authority (BQA) in the Kingdom of Bahrain is part of a cycle of continuing quality assurance reviews, reporting and improvement.

The follow-up visit applies to all programmes that have been reviewed using the Programmes-within-College Reviews Framework, and received a judgement of 'limited confidence' or 'no confidence'.

This Report provides an account of the follow-up process and findings of the follow-up panel whereby the Bachelor in Mass Communication, at the University of Bahrain (UoB) was revisited on 21-23 September 2020 to assess its progress in line with the published Programmes-within-College Reviews Framework and the BQA regulations.

A. Aims of the Follow-up Visit

- (i) Assess the progress made against the recommendations highlighted in the review report (in accordance with the four BQA Indicators) of UoB's Bachelor in Mass Communication since the programme was reviewed on 5-9 November 2017.
- (ii) Provide further information and support for the continuous improvement of academic standards and quality enhancement of higher education provision, specifically within the Bachelor in Mass Communication programme at UoB, and for higher education provision within the Kingdom of Bahrain, as a whole.

B. Background

The review of the Bachelor in Mass Communication, at UoB in the Kingdom of Bahrain was conducted by the DHR of the BQA on 5-9 November 2017. The overall judgement of the review panel for the programme was that of **'limited confidence'**. Consequently, the follow-up process incorporated the review of the evidence presented by UoB to the DHR, the Improvement Plan submitted to BQA, the Progress Report and its supporting materials and the documents submitted during the follow-up site visit and those extracted from the interview sessions.

The external review panel's judgement on the UoB's Bachelor in Mass Communication programme for each Indicator was as follows:

Indicator 1: The learning programme; 'satisfied'

Indicator 2: Efficiency of the programme; 'satisfied'

Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates; 'not satisfied'

Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance 'satisfied'

The follow-up visit was conducted by a (Panel) consisting of two members. This follow-up visit focused on assessing how the Institution addressed the recommendations of the report of the review conducted on 5-9 November 2017. For each recommendation given under the four Indicators, the Panel judged whether the recommendation is 'fully addressed', 'partially addressed', or 'not addressed' using the rubric in Appendix 1. An overall judgement of 'good progress', 'adequate progress' or 'inadequate progress' is given based on the rubric provided in Appendix 2.

C. Overview of the Bachelor in Mass Communication Programme

In the academic year 1998-1999, the Department of Mass Communication, Tourism and Fine Arts has been established. The Department offers two academic programmes; the Bachelor in Mass Communication and the Master in Mass Communication. With regard to the Bachelor in Mass Communication programme, it offers a number of tracks, namely: Journalism, Radio and TV, Public Relations, Advertising, and Digital Media, as per the study plan of 2016-2017. At the time of the follow-up visit, the total number of enrolled students in the programme was (931). There are (14) full-time academic members contributing to the delivery of the programme.

1. Indicator 1: The Learning Programme

This section evaluates the extent to which the Bachelor in Mass Communication programme of UoB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of November 2017, under Indicator 1: The learning programme and as a consequence provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

| No. | Recommendations | Judgement |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 1.1 | Ensure that the allocation of all courses and pre-requisites are modified in the new study plan, in order to achieve the greatest possible benefit for the student | Not Addressed |
| 1.2 | Review the specification of courses, to ensure its alignment with the programme objectives and needs | Not Addressed |
| 1.3 | Implement the procedures that contribute to using the e- learning properly, effectively, and in line with the teaching and learning strategy of the university to attain the educational outcomes, and measure their effectiveness | Partially Addressed |
| 1.4 | Provide feedback to the students, as per the University System of Study and Examination regulations. | Partially Addressed |

2. Indicator 2: Efficiency of the Programme

This section evaluates the extent to which the Bachelor in Mass Communication programme of UoB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of November 2017, under Indicator 2 Efficiency of the programme and as a consequence provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

| No. | Recommendations | Judgement |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 2.1 | Develop a proper mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of the applied admission criteria of the programme, through benchmarking, and systematically measure their effectiveness in the Department | Partially Addressed |
| 2.2 | Adopt a clear plan to increase the number of academic members in disciplines of Advertising, Radio and TV with consideration of selecting higher academic ranks, to decrease the academic workload of the faculty members, and to achieve the institution's goals by conducting scientific research, and encouraging community engagement | Not Addressed |
| 2.3 | Adopt a clear plan to support the faculty members to apply for promotion | Not Addressed |
| 2.4 | Organize a formal induction programme for new academic staff members on the department, college, and university levels to introduce them to the university policies, regulations, resources, and its different services, and evaluate the effectiveness of this programme | Partially Addressed |
| 2.5 | Update the university's studios and laboratories, and provide updated professional software to meet the programme needs | Partially Addressed |
| 2.6 | Further utilize the tracking reports and the updated data of the tracking systems to enhance the decisions taken to contribute in improving the educational process | Partially Addressed |
| 2.7 | Implement a clear plan for providing adequate academic support for students at risk of academic failure to help them to succeed and measure its effectiveness periodically. | Not Addressed |

3. Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates

This section evaluates the extent to which the Bachelor in Mass Communication programme of UoB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of November 2017, under Indicator 3: Academic standards of the graduates and as a consequence provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

| No. | Recommendations | Judgement |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 3.1 | Activate the University policy of benchmarking, and carry out a formal benchmarking for all aspects of the programme against other similar programmes, and utilize its results in improving the programme | Partially Addressed |
| 3.2 | Implement a rigorous mechanism to verify the effectiveness of all policies and procedures of the University related to the assessment of the students' achievement, such as providing the students with feedback, detecting the academic plagiarism, and applying moderation at the programme level to ensure that the graduates are meeting the academic standards of the programme | Partially Addressed |
| 3.3 | Activate the University's procedures related to the internal moderation process for the assessment methods in the programme, evaluate its effectiveness, and implement the internal moderation process by specialized academics | Fully Addressed |
| 3.4 | Apply formal appropriate procedures for the external moderation, utilize the feedback from the external moderation results in developing the programme and improving the courses | Partially Addressed |
| 3.5 | Ensure that examinations are measuring the critical thinking skills alongside the skills of memorizing; and take into consideration achieving a fairer distribution of grades within courses | Partially Addressed |
| 3.6 | Implement a holistic study and a systematic analysis for the student cohorts of the programme, in order to identify graduates destination, investigate the reasons behind the length of the study period, and utilize the results in developing the programme | Partially Addressed |
| 3.7 | Track the implementation of internship assessment policies and the adherence of the training institutions to the training plan, in order to ensure that all trainees are subject to similar | Partially Addressed |

| | experiences to accomplish the objectives of the course and | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| | the programme effectively | |
| 3.8 | Develop and implement policy and procedures for supervising and assessing the graduation project, as well as identifying and documenting the responsibilities and duties of both student and supervisor | Not Addressed |
| 3.9 | Ensure an effective role for the advisory councils, to utilize further their suggestions and recommendations in the decision-making process of the programme. | Not Addressed |

4. Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance

This section evaluates the extent to which the Bachelor in Mass Communication programme of UoB, has addressed the recommendations outlined in the programme review report of November 2017, under Indicator 4: Effectiveness of quality management and assurance and as a consequence provides a judgment regarding the level of implementation of each recommendation for this Indicator as outlined in Appendix 1 of this Report.

| No. | Recommendations | Judgement |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 4.1 | Improve the used approaches to monitor and evaluate the quality assurance management system of the programme and measure its effectiveness | Partially Addressed |
| 4.2 | Implement arrangements for a comprehensive periodic review of the programme; and develop mechanisms for tracking and monitoring the implementation of improvement plans | Not Addressed |
| 4.3 | Continue to develop its mechanisms to survey its | |
| | developing the programme, and inform all the concerned internal and external stakeholders about the results | |
| 4.4 | Conduct rigorous and holistic studies about the labour market, provide detailed information to enable the programme to identify current and future labour market needs. | Not Addressed |

5. Conclusion

Taking into account the institution's own progress report, the evidence gathered from the interviews and documentation made available during the follow-up visit, the Panel draws the following conclusion in accordance with the DHR/BQA Follow-up Visits of Academic Programme Reviews Procedure:

The Bachelor in Mass Communication programme offered by the University of Bahrain has made "Inadequate Progress".

Appendix 1: Judgement per recommendation.

| Judgement | Standard |
|------------------------|--|
| Fully Addressed | The institution has demonstrated marked progress in addressing the recommendation. The actions taken by the programme team have led to significant improvements in the identified aspect and, as a consequence, in meeting the Indicator's requirements. |
| Partially Addressed | The institution has taken positive actions to address the recommendation. There is evidence that these actions have produced improvements and that these improvements are sustainable. The actions taken are having a positive, yet limited impact on the ability of the programme to meet the Indicator's requirements. |
| Not Addressed | The institution has not taken appropriate actions to address the recommendation and/or actions taken have little or no impact on the quality of the programme delivery and the academic standards. Weaknesses persist in relation to this recommendation. |

Appendix 2: Overall Judgement.

| Overall Judgement | Standard |
|------------------------|--|
| Good progress | The institution has fully addressed the majority of the recommendations contained in the review report, and/or previous follow-up report, these include recommendations that have most impact on the quality of the programme, its delivery and academic standards. The remaining recommendations are partially addressed. No further follow-up visit is required. |
| Adequate progress | The institution has at least partially addressed most of the recommendations contained in the review report and/or previous follow-up report, including those that have major impact on the quality of the programme, its delivery and academic standards. There is a number of recommendations that have been fully addressed and there is evidence that the institution can maintain the progress achieved. No further follow-up visit is required. |
| Inadequate progress | The institution has made little or no progress in addressing a significant number of the recommendations contained in the review report and/or previous follow-up report, especially those that have main impact on the quality of the programme, its delivery and academic standards. For first follow-up visits, a second follow-up visit is required, |